

## REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the office action of June 5, 2007 in which the Examiner made certain objections to the abstract and claims. A new abstract is attached. The claims have been amended to correct the objections noted by the Examiner. The amendments do not change the scope of the claims and said amendments should not be considered as limiting the claims in any way. Entry of the amendments and allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 6 as unpatentable over Riello in view of Bottaro. According to the Examiner, Riello teaches an air conditioner wherein the condenser and evaporator are aligned one behind the other.

The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants herewith submit marked drawings. The first drawing shows Figs 4 and 5 of the invention. The second drawing shows Fig. 3 of Riello, cited by the Examiner. In the invention, the evaporator 5 and the condenser 2 lie in alignment on opposite sides of a plane Y – Y. In Riello, the evaporator and the condenser are not aligned one behind the other.

Referring to figs 4 and 5 of the invention, it can be readily appreciated that the evaporator 5 and condenser 2 are separated and disposed on opposite sides of a plane Y – Y. This arrangement is not a matter of pure choice. The arrangement allows only the evaporator to project into the room and the condenser, including the compressor is positioned within the part of the housing that is located in the hole formed in the wall.

The invention separates the elements in such a way that achieves a number of advantages. The noise generated by the compressor is better confined within the part of the housing located in the hole. Likewise the environmental impact of the device outside of the building is limited as well because the condenser is in wholly within the wall. In addition, the inside surfaces of the housing lining the hole provides additional heat exchange surfaces for the heat produced by the compressor.

In Riello the compressor and evaporator are not aligned on opposite sides of a plane, but overlap. The Y' – Y' in the reference passes through both the compressor and evaporator parts. Accordingly, the elements are not separated by the plane.

Indeed the reference speaks about a suitably shaped partition wall 24 at Column 3 line 68. The partition wall separate the interior spaces 26 and 28.

None of the references noted by the Examiner suggest ways in which the advantages of the invention are achieved. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the rejection and allow the claims.

New claim 9 further emphasizes the features of the invention in greater detail.

Respectfully submitted,  
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC  
/John P. De Luca/  
electronic signature

---

John P. DeLuca  
Registration No. 25,505  
Attorney for Applicant

Customer Number 66804  
John P. De Luca  
17420 Ryefield Ct.  
Dickerson, MD 20842  
301 349 2899